UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/761,123	01/20/2004	Baofeng Frank Jiang	1033-NW1002	8791	
60533 TOLER SCHA	7590 02/09/2007 FFER. LLP		EXAMINER		
8500 BLUFFS	•	TRAN, QUOC DUC			
SUITE A201 AUSTIN, TX 7	78759		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ŕ			2614		
			. <del></del>		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	, DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS		02/09/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/761,123	JIANG ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Quoc D. Tran	2614			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the	ne correspondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANS IN THE MAILING DANS IN (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply by the state of the	ION.  be timely filed  from the mailing date of this communication.  ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 Ja	nuary 2004.				
2a) <u></u> □	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11	, 453 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-3,5-15,17 and 18 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) 4 and 16 is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or					
Applicati	on Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on 20 January 2004 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examinary	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objecdrawing(s) be held in abeyance. on is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment	c(s)					
2) 🔲 Notice 3) 🔯 Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:	il Date			

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

1. Claim 14 is objected to because of the following informalities: typographical errors in the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider et al (6,819,746).

Consider claims 1 and 10, Schneider et al teach an automated method and system of adjusting digital subscriber line (DSL) performance (i.e., classification of service; see abstract), the method and system comprising: evaluating performance of a plurality of DSL lines using a computer based system; automatically selecting a set of DSL lines from the plurality of DSL lines, the set of DSL lines having degraded performance characteristics based on historical performance data accessible with respect to the computer based system (col. 4 lines 1-15; col. 8 lines 12-28; It should be noted that degrading performance may be determined based on monitoring or report based on customers trouble reports, see col. 6 lines 63-67); retrieving a plurality of line profiles from a profile database (col. 4 lines 1-15; col. 8 lines 12-28); measuring a performance parameter for each of the set of DSL lines (col. 7 line 60 – col. 8 line 7; col. 10 lines 35-42; i.e., performing qualification of lines); moving from the set of DSL lines any DSL

Art Unit: 2614

lines that have suitable performance based on the measured performance parameter to create a revised set of DSL lines with degraded performance (col. 17 line 62 – col. 18 line 13; and applying one of the plurality of line profiles to each of the physical DSL lines identified by the revised set of DSL lines (col. 11 lines 1-21; level or quality of service read on the profiles).

It is acknowledged that Schneider et al disclosure is directed to qualifying or classifying or certifying DSL services for "new lines" rather than "existing DSL lines" as being claimed. However, col. 16 lines 44-46 suggested of providing information related to incompatible DSL lines. Therefore, it would have been obvious to modify the process of Schneider to qualifying or classifying or certifying existing DSL lines instead of new lines to check the integrity of the inservice lines or for quality assurance purposes.

Consider claim 2, Schneider et al teach the method further comprising storing data associated with the set of DSL lines (col. 8 lines 12-26).

Consider claims 3, 11 and 15, col. 12 line 59 – col. 13 lines 30 read on the limitations as claimed.

Consider claims 5 and 17, Schneider et al teach wherein each of the set of DSL lines is associated with one of the plurality of line profiles before the step of measuring a performance parameter for each of the set of DSL lines (col. 6 line 63 – col. 7 line 19).

Consider claims 6 and 18, Schneider et al teach wherein at least some of the plurality of line profiles associated with the set of DSL lines are the same profiles that are applied to each of the physical DSL lines (col. 6 line 63 – col. 7 line 19; col. 11 lines 1-21).

Application/Control Number: 10/761,123

Art Unit: 2614

Consider claim 7, Schneider et al teach wherein application of one of the plurality of line profiles to a physical DSL lines fails and where an error message is reported (col. 16 lines 44-59).

Page 4

Consider claims 8-9 and 14, Col. 6 line 63 – col. 7 line 19 and col. 11 lines 1-21 read on the claimed limitations.

Consider claims 12-13, Col. 6 line 63 – col. 7 line 19; col. 8 lines 13-35 read on the claimed limitations.

### Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 4 and 16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### **Conclusion**

- 5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 6. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Mail Stop \_\_\_\_\_(explanation, e.g., Amendment or After-final, etc.)
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
Facsimile responses should be faxed to:

(571) 273-8300

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to:
Customer Service Window
Randolph Building
401 Dulany Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Art Unit: 2614

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Quoc Tran** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-7511**. The examiner can normally be reached on M, T, TH and Friday from 8:00 to 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the **Technology Center 2600** whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

QUOCTRAN PRIMARYEXAMINER

January 30, 2007